arXiv:1405.7552v2 [quant-ph] 15 Aug 2014

Adiabatic optimization without local minima

Michael Jarret[1] and Stephen P. Jordan[2]

[1]Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111
[2]Applied and Computational Mathematics Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899

Abstract

Several previous works have investigated the circumstances under which quantum adiabatic optimization algorithms can tunnel out of local energy minima that trap simulated annealing or other classical local search algorithms. Here we investigate the even more basic question of whether adiabatic optimization algorithms always succeed in polynomial time for trivial optimization problems in which there are no local energy minima other than the global minimum. Surprisingly, we find a counterexample in which the potential is a single basin on a graph, but the eigenvalue gap is exponentially small as a function of the number of vertices. In this counterexample, the ground state wavefunction consists of two "lobes" separated by a region of exponentially small amplitude. Conversely, we prove if the ground state wavefunction is single-peaked then the eigenvalue gap scales at worst as one over the square of the number of vertices.

1 Introduction

In adiabatic quantum algorithms one starts with an initial Hamiltonian whose ground state is easy to construct, such as a tensor product state. One prepares the system in its ground state and then slowly varies the Hamiltonian to reach one whose ground state encodes the solution to a computational problem of interest [21]. The adiabatic theorem states that if the time-variation of the Hamiltonian is performed sufficiently slowly then the system will track the instantaneous ground state, thereby solving the computational problem. Specifically, for constant-rate interpolation between the initial and final Hamiltonians, it suffices to choose the duration of the adiabatic process to scale as $1/\gamma^3$, where γ is the minimal eigenvalue gap between the ground state and first excited state during the adiabatic process [24]. (More recently, it has been shown that, by instead choosing the Hamiltonian's interpolation schedule to be a smooth function with zero initial and final time-derivative, one can provably achieve runtime of $\widetilde{O}(1/\gamma^2)$ [17].) Adiabatic quantum computation with sufficiently general Hamiltonians can perform universal quantum computation [2]. However, the most natural application for adiabatic quantum algorithms is optimization, and most analysis has focused on this case.

One of the original intuitions behind adiabatic quantum computation (and an earlier classical algorithm called quantum annealing [22]) was that quantum optimization algorithms could in some cases tunnel out of local minima that simulated annealing would fail to climb out of. The runtime of adiabatic algorithms for various specific potentials with local minima has been analyzed

in [30, 32, 19, 33, 7, 6]. Here we investigate the more basic question of whether quantum adiabatic algorithms always succeed in efficiently solving "trivial" optimization problems that have no local energy minima other than the global minimum. Surprisingly, we find a counterexample in which the potential has no local minima other than the global minimum, yet the eigenvalue gap is exponentially small.

Specifically, we consider Hamiltonians associated with graphs, consisting of the graph Laplacian plus a potential on the vertices. (The dimension of the Hilbert space is the number of vertices in the graph. The vertices may be labeled with bit strings corresponding to basis states of a set of qubits. Physically, one can interpret the Hamiltonian as describing a single particle hopping amongst the vertices.) In §3 we construct a single-basin potential on a graph such that the eigenvalue gap between the ground state and first excited state is exponentially small as a function of the number of vertices. This corresponds to a trivial optimization problem for which classical gradient descent finds the minimal-energy vertex in linear time.

Strictly speaking, the exponentially small eigenvalue gap in our example does not necessarily imply that an adiabatic algorithm fails to solve this problem. For this one would need to invoke a converse of the adiabatic theorem, and one would furthermore need to show that diabatic transitions between eigenstates cause algorithmic failure in a practical sense. (Indeed, an example of algorithmic success despite failure of adiabaticity is given in [27].) However, our construction serves as a counterexample to a natural and perhaps even widely assumed conjecture, namely that potentials without local minima yield polynomial eigenvalue gaps.

Our counterexample has a ground state consisting of two "lobes" with exponentially small amplitude in the region between them. In §4 we use arguments based on conductance of Markov chains to show that the eigenvalue gap shrinks at worst quadratically with the number of vertices provided the ground state wavefunction is single-peaked. (See proposition 4.) Thus, the two-lobed nature of the ground state in our counterexample is an essential feature. In other words, we find that the structure of local extrema in the potential does not neatly characterize the eigenvalue gap, but the structure of the local extrema of the ground state wavefunction does.

We also specifically investigate the one-dimensional case, called the path graph. We show that for convex[1] potentials, the ground state wavefunction is single-peaked. This yields, as a consequence of proposition 4, an $\Omega(1/(|W|\ell^2))$ lower bound on the gap for the path of ℓ vertices and a potential of norm $|W|$. By adapting Poincaré's inequality we are able to obtain an $\Omega(1/\ell^2)$ lower bound, with no dependence on $|W|$. This lower bound is tight to within a constant factor [25], and forms a discrete analog of [28]. Previous work has shown that for symmetric potentials on the path graph that increase as one moves away from the center, the eigenvalue gap is lower bounded by $\Omega(1/\ell^2)$ [8]. Our result is incomparable to that of [8] in that such potentials are not a special case of convex potentials nor vice-versa.

Much of the research on adiabatic quantum algorithms seeks to achieve exponential speedups over classical algorithms. For this purpose, one seeks to find a potential on a highly-connected graph of exponentially many vertices (often the hypercube) such that the eigenvalue gap is only polynomially small. This differs somewhat from the setting studied in the present paper - we consider graphs of polynomially many vertices and ask whether the gap is exponentially small or polynomially small. Thus, our counterexample in which the gap is already exponentially small on a graph of only polynomially many vertices constitutes an even more extreme gap collapse than previous examples such as [5]. On the other hand, our gap lower bounds ("positive results")

[1] Actually, our result holds under the slightly weaker condition that the potential be "single-basin". See §4.3.

might appear weak - they provide $\Omega(1/|V_G|^2)$ lower bounds on the eigenvalue gap where $|V_G|$ is the number of vertices in the underlying graph. However, in some highly symmetric cases, such as optimization problems on the hypercube with potentials that depend only on Hamming distance from the energy minimum, the eigenvalue gap can be analyzed by collapsing the Hamiltonian to a spectrally-equivalent Hamiltonian on an exponentially smaller graph. (In the hypercube case, the vertices of the collapsed graph correspond to the allowed Hamming weights, see *e.g.* [25].) Application of the tools presented here for lower-bounding gaps in such cases remains for future work.

2 Preliminaries

Let G be a graph with vertices V_G and edges $E_G \subseteq V_G \times V_G$. Let $\mathcal{H}_G = \mathrm{span}\{|x\rangle | x \in V_G\}$ be a complex Hilbert space with $\langle x|y\rangle = \delta_{x,y}$. Let L_G denote the Laplacian of G acting on $\mathcal{H}$. That is,

$$L_G = \sum_{x \in V_G} d_x |x\rangle\langle x| - \sum_{(x,y) \in E_G} |x\rangle\langle y|, \tag{1}$$

where d_x denotes the degree of vertex x.

The subject of spectral graph theory is devoted to analysis of the eigenvalue spectra of graph Laplacians [14]. Here, motivated by applications to adiabatic quantum computation [21], we develop some theorems about the spectra of more general graph-related Hamiltonians of the form

$$H_{G,W} = L_G + \sum_{x \in V_G} W(x) |x\rangle\langle x|, \tag{2}$$

where $W : V_G \to \mathbb{R}$ is a potential energy function.

We say that $x \in V_G$ is a local minimum of W if $W(x) \leq W(y)$ for all y such that $(x, y) \in E_G$. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, the ground state of $H_{G,W}$ can be expressed in the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x \in V_G} \psi(x) |x\rangle \tag{3}$$

with $\psi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in V_G$. We say that ψ has a local maximum at x if

$$\psi(x) \geq \psi(y) \ \forall y \text{ s.t. } (x, y) \in E_G. \tag{4}$$

In §4.2 we prove a lower bound on the eigenvalue gap in the case that the ground state wavefunction is single-peaked. By this, we mean that the set of local maxima of ψ form a connected set of vertices in G. This is a weaker condition than demanding that ψ have only a single local maximum, in that we allow the peak to consist of multiple vertices on which ψ is constant.

Most adiabatic optimization algorithms proposed to date use the following formulation. The optimization problem is formalized as a search on a graph G. The edges of the graph E_G represent the allowed moves within the search space. The vertices V_G represent the possible solutions, and one seeks to minimize the cost function $W : V_G \to \mathbb{R}$. For simplicity we assume that W has a unique global minimum $x_{\min} \in V_G$. Let

$$H_{G,W}(s) = (1 - s) L_G + s \sum_{x \in V_G} W(x) |x\rangle\langle x|. \tag{5}$$

The computation starts in the uniform superposition over vertices of G, which is the ground state of $H_{G,W}(0)$. Then, one applies a slowly-varying Hamiltonian $H_{G,W}(t/\tau)$. According to the adiabatic theorem, if τ is taken sufficiently large, the system will track the instantaneous ground state, and at the end of the computation, one will be left with the ground state of $H(1)$, namely $|x_{\min}\rangle$. More quantitatively, the adiabatic theorem [24] shows that it suffices to take $\tau = O(1/\gamma^3)$, where $\gamma = \min_{0\le s\le 1} \gamma(s)$ and $\gamma(s)$ is the eigenvalue gap between the ground energy and first excited energy of $H_{G,W}(s)$. (Heuristic arguments suggest that in many cases $\tau = O(1/\gamma^2)$ suffices [26]. For careful choices of $s(t)$, which do not include the choice $s = t/\tau$ considered here, this has been shown to hold rigorously [17]. See §6 for more discussion of this point.)

Let

$$\hat{H}_{G,W}(s) = \frac{H_{G,W}(s)}{1-s}. \tag{6}$$

One sees that $\hat{H}_{G,W}(s)$ is of the form (2) for all $s \in [0,1)$. Furthermore, the eigenvalue gap $\gamma(s)$ is given by

$$\gamma(s) = (1-s)\hat{\gamma}(s), \tag{7}$$

where $\hat{\gamma}(s)$ is the eigenvalue gap of $\hat{H}_{G,W}(s)$. Thus, theorems yielding upper or lower bounds on the eigenvalue gap of Hamiltonians of the form (2) yield useful bounds on the eigenvalue gap of $H_{G,W}(s)$ throughout the adiabatic algorithm except when s is very close to one. The gap analysis for s very close to one can be performed by other means, as discussed in §6. Throughout the rest of this paper, our focus will be on bounding gaps for Hamiltonians of the form (2).

Some works, such as [18, 20, 15], have considered adiabatic optimization algorithms with paths other than the linear interpolation defined by (5). In certain cases this has been shown to improve runtime. Most of the proposed alternative paths involve non-uniform changes to the off-diagonal matrix elements. Unlike (5), such Hamiltonians cannot be put into the form (2) by rescaling. Instead, they correspond to (2) where the Laplacian is of a weighted graph. The analysis of such Hamiltonians thus goes beyond the scope of this paper, although techniques related to those described here may be applicable.

3 Small Gaps Without Local Minima

Given a connected graph G, a potential W on the vertices, and a Hamiltonian $H_{G,W}$ of the form given in (2), one is tempted to conjecture that if G has only polynomially many vertices and W has no local minima (other than a global minimum) then $H_{G,W}$ can't have an exponentially small gap. In this section we construct a counterexample to this conjecture. In fact, beyond lack of local minima, our counterexample satisfies the even stronger condition that the potential forms a monotonic basin leading to a unique vertex of minimal potential. That is, there is no connected region of constant potential.

Consider the following "caterpillar" graph of $6\ell - 1$ vertices, as illustrated below.



We consider a potential on the vertices with left-right and top-bottom mirror symmetries, and we correspondingly label equivalent vertices with identical labels. Our potential is as follows[2].

$$\begin{aligned} W(B_0) &= 0 \\ W(B_j) &= -\tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{j}{4l} \qquad j \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\} \\ W(C_1) &= \tfrac{1}{\frac{11}{12} - \frac{1}{8\ell}} - 1 \\ W(C_\ell) &= 7 \\ W(C_j) &= \tfrac{1}{\frac{2}{3} - \frac{j}{8\ell}} - 1 \quad j \in \{2, \ldots, \ell - 1\} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

One sees that this potential is a single basin funneling to the unique minimum-potential vertex B_ℓ. (See Fig. 1.) The following unnormalized eigenstate has eigenvalue zero.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(B_0) &= \tfrac{2}{3} \\ \psi(B_j) &= \left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^j \qquad\qquad j \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\} \\ \psi(C_\ell) &= \tfrac{1}{8}\left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^\ell \\ \psi(C_1) &= \tfrac{2}{3}\left(\tfrac{11}{12} - \tfrac{1}{8\ell}\right) \\ \psi(C_j) &= \left(\tfrac{2}{3} - \tfrac{j}{8\ell}\right)\left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^j \quad j \in \{2, \ldots, \ell - 1\} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

All off-diagonal elements of the Hamiltonian $H_{G,W}$ are nonpositive. Therefore, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, its ground state is the only eigenstate with all nonnegative amplitudes [10]. Hence, we can identify ψ as the ground state of $H_{G,W}$.

A ground state consisting of two symmetric lobes, such as ψ, implies a small eigenvalue gap because, by flipping the signs of the amplitudes in one lobe, one obtains an orthogonal state of only slightly higher energy. This energy cost, which upper-bounds the eigenvalue gap, is small due to the smallness of the amplitudes between the lobes.

More precisely, consider the wavefunction ϕ, which equals ψ for all vertices to the left of B_ℓ, equals $-\psi$ for all vertices to the right of B_ℓ, and equals zero at B_ℓ and C_ℓ. One sees that ϕ is orthogonal to ψ. Let $\eta = \langle\phi|\phi\rangle$ and let $|\widetilde{\phi}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}}|\phi\rangle$ be the normalized version of $|\phi\rangle$. The first excited state is variationally characterized as the lowest energy state orthogonal to the ground state. Therefore the energy of the first excited state is at most $\langle\widetilde{\phi}|H_{G,W}|\widetilde{\phi}\rangle$. Because the ground energy is zero we thus have

$$\gamma \leq \langle\widetilde{\phi}|H_{G,W}|\widetilde{\phi}\rangle. \tag{10}$$

By construction, $|\phi\rangle$ satisfies the eigenvalue zero equation everywhere except at the B_ℓ vertex and the two $B_{\ell-1}$ vertices. Using this fact, one finds

$$\langle\phi|H_{G,W}|\phi\rangle = 2\psi(B_\ell)\psi(B_{\ell-1}). \tag{11}$$

[2]Curious readers may wonder how this potential was arrived at. One can choose a desired ground state and potential on the B vertices, set the ground energy to zero, and solve for the wavefunction and potential on the C vertices. With some trial and error one can find choices such that the wavefunction at B_ℓ is exponentially small, yet the potential on each C vertex is greater than the potential on the B vertex to which it is connected and the ground state amplitudes are nonnegative on all vertices.



Figure 1: We illustrate the ground state wavefunction ψ and the potential W for $\ell = 4$. The ground state ψ consists of two lobes separated by a region of small amplitude in the center. The potential along the "spine" of the caterpillar is negative and decreasing as one approaches the central vertex B_4. The potential is positive on the "legs" of the caterpillar. Thus, the classical steepest-descent algorithm starting from any initial vertex will reach the minimum (B_4) by the shortest path. Note that the potential on the C_4 vertices is approximately ten times as large as the second largest value of the potential, and thus it is cut off by the boundaries of the figure.

By (9) one sees that $\eta > 1$. Therefore, (10) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\leq 2\eta^{-1}\psi(B_\ell)\psi(B_{\ell-1}) && (12)\\ &< 2\psi(B_\ell)\psi(B_{\ell-1}) && (13)\\ &= 2\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{2\ell-1}. && (14) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, without any local minima in the potential and with only $O(\ell)$ vertices we obtain an eigenvalue gap of $O((2/3)^{2\ell})$.

4 Conductance-based Gap Bounds

In the preceding section, we showed that a ground state consisting of two symmetric lobes separated by a region of small amplitude implies a small eigenvalue gap. We relied on the symmetry of the lobes to construct a low-energy state orthogonal to the ground state by flipping the sign of the amplitudes on one lobe. However, it is true more generally that lobes separated by a region of small amplitude imply a small gap even if the lobes are asymmetric, provided the imbalance is not too severe. In this section we use concept of conductance to make this precise, and conversely to prove that if the ground state wavefunction is single-peaked, then the eigenvalue gap cannot be smaller than $\Omega(|V_G|^{-2})$.

4.1 Conductance

Motivated by applications to rapidly mixing Markov chains, sophisticated tools have been developed to bound the difference between the largest and second-largest eigenvalues of stochastic matrices. In this subsection, we recount one such tool, known as conductance.

Consider a discrete-time random walk on G defined by transition matrix P. That is, for $x, y \in V_G$, P_{xy} is the probability for a walker at x to transition to y in a given timestep. Thus, P is a row-stochastic matrix. Conductance provides upper and lower bounds on the gap between the largest and second largest eigenvalues of row-stochastic matrices in the case that the random walks they define are ergodic and reversible. Ergodicity means that the random walk converges to the same limiting distribution independent of the starting point of the walker. Reversibility means that, in the limiting distribution, the probability of traversing a given edge in one direction is equal to the probability of traversing it in the opposite direction. More formally, we recount the following definitions and facts from [31].

Definition 1. *The random walk defined by transition matrix P on vertex set V_G is ergodic if*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} (P^s)_{xy} = \pi_y \quad \textit{independent of } x. \tag{15}$$

The probability distribution π is then called the limiting distribution of the random walk.

Proposition 1. *The following conditions are necessary and sufficient for ergodicity of P.*

1. *P is irreducible. That is, for each $x, y \in V_G$ there is $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(P^s)_{xy} > 0$.*
2. *P is aperiodic. That is, for all x, y, $\gcd\{s|(P^s)_{xy} > 0\} = 1$.*

Definition 2. *An ergodic random walk given by transition matrix P on vertex set V_G is reversible if*

$$\pi_x P_{xy} = \pi_y P_{yx} \quad \forall x, y \in V_G, \tag{16}$$

where π is the limiting distribution.

Definition 3. *Let P be the transition matrix of a reversible ergodic random walk on graph G with vertices V_G and edges E_G. Let π be the corresponding limiting distribution. Let S be any non-empty subset of V_G and let $\bar{S} = V_G/S$ be its complement. Let*

$$F_S = \sum_{\substack{(x,y)\in E_G \\ x\in S, y\in \bar{S}}} \pi_x P_{xy} \tag{17}$$

$$C_S = \sum_{x\in S} \pi_x \tag{18}$$

$$\Phi_S(P) = \frac{F_S}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} \tag{19}$$

$$\Phi(P) = \min_{S\subset V_G} \Phi_S(P). \tag{20}$$

$\Phi(P)$ is called the conductance of P.

The quantity F_S is called the flow of S, and the quantity P_S is called the probability of S. Note that, for reversible random walks, $F_S = F_{\bar{S}}$. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, the largest eigenvalue of any irreducible stochastic matrix is 1 and the corresponding eigenspace is one-dimensional. Furthermore, this eigenvector can be written with all nonnegative entries. Adapting theorems 2.4 and 2.6 of [31] one has the following.

Proposition 2. *(from [31]) Let matrix P define a reversible ergodic random walk with conductance $\Phi(P)$. Let γ denote the gap between the largest eigenvalue of P (which is 1) and the second-largest eigenvalue. Then*

$$\frac{\Phi(P)^2}{2} \leq \gamma \leq 2\Phi(P). \tag{21}$$

Proposition 2 is based on Cheeger's inequality [12] for the spectrum of Laplacians of manifolds, which was adapted to graphs by Alon and Milman [4], and extended to stochastic matrices by Sinclair [31].

4.2 Conductance Bound

In this subsection we use conductance to prove lower bounds on the gap of Hamiltonians of the form $H_{G,W}$ given in (2), culminating in a proof that the "lobed" nature of the ground state wavefunction in the counterexample from §3 is a necessary feature to obtain exponentially small gap. Specifically, we show that if $H_{G,W}$ has a single-peaked ground state then its eigenvalue gap has an $\Omega(|W|^{-1}|V_G|^{-2})$ lower bound, where $|V_G|$ is the number of vertices in the graph G and $|W| = \max_{x\in V_G} W(x) - \min_{x\in V_G} W(x)$.

Given a connected graph G, and a potential W on the vertices, let $H_{G,W}$ be the corresponding Hamiltonian of the form (2). Let γ denote the energy gap between the ground state and first

excited state of $H_{G,W}$. For the purpose of bounding γ we may assume without loss of generality that the potential satisfies $W(x) < -d_G \quad \forall x \in V_G$, where d_G is the maximum degree of any vertex in G. If this is not the case, one can always subtract a sufficiently large multiple of the identity matrix to make it so without affecting γ.

Let $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x \in V_G} \psi(x)|x\rangle$ denote the ground state of $H_{G,W}$ and E the ground energy. Let N_x be the neighbors of vertex x. That is,

$$N_x = \{y \in V_G | (x, y) \in E_G\}. \tag{22}$$

In this notation,

$$(d_x + W(x))\psi(x) - \sum_{y \in N_x} \psi(y) = E\psi(x). \tag{23}$$

For connected G,

$$\psi(x) > 0 \quad \forall x. \tag{24}$$

Thus we may rearrange (23) to obtain

$$d_x + W(x) - \sum_{y \in N_x} \psi(y)/\psi(x) = E. \tag{25}$$

Also, note that H has all nonpositive entries, so $E < 0$.

We next adapt a technique from [1, 11, 3] to relate the spectrum of $H_{G,W}$ to the spectrum of a random walk. Let $D = \mathrm{diag}\{\psi(x) | x \in V_G\}$. By (24), D is an invertible matrix with $D^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}\{\psi(x)^{-1} | x \in V_G\}$. Let

$$P = \frac{1}{E} D^{-1} H_{G,W} D. \tag{26}$$

By (25), $\sum_{y \in V_G} \langle x|P|y\rangle = 1$. That is, P is a row-stochastic matrix.

Because $E < 0$, the lowest eigenvalue of H corresponds to the highest eigenvalue of P, which is 1. Specifically, let

$$|\psi^2\rangle = \sum_{x \in V_G} \psi(x)^2 |x\rangle. \tag{27}$$

One sees that

$$\langle \psi^2 | P = \langle \psi^2 |. \tag{28}$$

Hence the probability distribution ψ^2 is a limiting distribution of the random walk defined by P. Connectedness of the graph G suffices to ensure that condition 1 of proposition 1 is satisfied. The requirement that $W(x) < -d_G$ for all $x \in V_G$ ensures that condition 2 of proposition 1 is satisfied [31]. Thus, P is an ergodic random walk. In other words, ψ^2 is the unique limiting distribution of P and correspondingly $|\psi\rangle$ is the nondegenerate ground state of $H_{G,W}$. By direct calculation, one finds

$$\psi(x)^2 P_{xy} = \psi(y)^2 P_{yx} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{E}\psi(x)\psi(y) & \text{if } (x, y) \in E_g \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

Thus, P is a reversible ergodic random walk. Therefore, by proposition 2 and equation (26), the energy gap γ between the ground and first-excited states of $H_{G,W}$ satisfies

$$-\frac{E}{2}\Phi^2(P) \leq \gamma \leq -2E\Phi(P). \tag{30}$$

One sees that the flow between $S \subset V_G$ and its complement determined by P is

$$F_S(P) = \sum_{\substack{x \in S \\ y \in \bar{S}}} \frac{\psi(x)\psi(y)}{-E} \tag{31}$$

and the corresponding probability is

$$C_S(P) = \sum_{x \in S} \psi(x)^2. \tag{32}$$

Thus, by (30) one obtains the following result.

Proposition 3. *(cf. [1, 11, 3]) Let $H_{G,W}$ be a Hamiltonian of the form (2) with $W(x) \leq -d_G \quad \forall x \in V_G$. Let ψ denote the ground state of $H_{G,W}$, let E denote the ground energy, and let γ denote the gap between the ground energy and the first excited energy. Then,*

$$-\frac{1}{2E}\Phi_H^2 \leq \gamma \leq 2\Phi_H \tag{33}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_H &= \min_{S \subset V_G} \frac{F_S}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} && (34)\\
F_S &= \sum_{(x,y) \in B} \psi(x)\psi(y) && (35)\\
B &= \{(x,y) | x \in S, y \notin S, (x,y) \in E_G\} && (36)\\
C_S &= \sum_{x \in S} \psi(x)^2 && (37)\\
C_{\bar{S}} &= \sum_{\substack{x \in V_G \\ x \notin S}} \psi(x)^2. && (38)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $E < 0$ and therefore the lower bound on γ given by (33) is nonnegative.

Examining (33) one sees that the gap is exponentially small if and only if the ground state has a pair of not-too-unbalanced lobes separated by a region of exponentially small amplitude. Choosing S and $\bar{S}$ to be the lobes, one sees that S and $\bar{S}$ must have reasonably well-balanced ground state probabilities for the denominator $\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}$ to remain large, and the amplitudes along the cut separating S from $\bar{S}$ must all be small for the numerator F_S to be small. More precisely, recalling from §2 the definition of single-peaked, we have the following, which is the main result of this section.

Proposition 4. *Let G be a connected graph with vertices V_G, edges E_G, and maximum degree d_G. Let $W : V_G \to \mathbb{R}$ be a potential, and $H_{G,W}$ the corresponding Hamiltonian described in (2). Let ψ denote the ground state of $H_{G,W}$ and let γ denote the eigenvalue gap between the ground state and first excited state of $H_{G,W}$. If ψ is single-peaked then*

$$\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W| + d_G)|V_G|^2} \tag{39}$$

where

$$|W| = \max_{x \in V_G} W(x) - \min_{x \in V_G} W(x). \tag{40}$$

Proof. Let

$$H^{(-)}_{G,W} = H_{G,W} - (W_{\max} + d_G)\mathbb{1} \tag{41}$$

where $W_{\max} = \max_{x \in V_G} W(x)$. One sees that $H^{(-)}_{G,W}$ has the same ground state ψ and same gap γ as $H_{G,W}$ and that all matrix elements in $H^{(-)}_{G,W}$ are nonpositive. Hence, by proposition 3,

$$\gamma \geq -\frac{1}{2E^{(-)}} \left(\min_{S \subset V_G} \frac{F_S}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} \right)^2 \tag{42}$$

where $E^{(-)}$ is the ground energy of $H^{(-)}_{G,W}$, namely

$$E^{(-)} = E - (W_{\max} + d_G), \tag{43}$$

and F_S, C_S, and $C_{\bar{S}}$ are as in (35)-(38). Graph Laplacians are positive semidefinite, and therefore $E \geq W_{\min}$. Thus,

$$E^{(-)} \geq -|W| - d_G. \tag{44}$$

Hence, (42) yields

$$\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W| + d_G)} \left(\min_{S \subset V_G} \frac{F_S}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} \right)^2. \tag{45}$$

We now consider two cases: 1) the peak of ψ spans the cut $\{S, \bar{S}\}$, and 2) the peak of ψ is contained entirely within one side of the cut.

Case 1: If the peak of ψ spans the cut then there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in \bar{S}$ such that $(x, y) \in E_G$ and $\psi(x) = \psi(y) \geq \psi(z)\ \forall z \in V_G$. We can lower bound γ by throwing away the flows across all edges in the numerator other than (x, y). Thus,

$$\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W| + d_G)} \left(\frac{\psi(x)^2}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} \right)^2. \tag{46}$$

Furthermore, $\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\} \leq \psi(x)^2 |V_G|$, and therefore $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W|+d)|V_G|^2}$.

Case 2: If the peak of ψ is contained within one side of the cut, we may, without loss of generality, call the side containing the peak S and the other side $\bar{S}$. Let $x_{\max}$ be the vertex in $\bar{S}$ that maximizes ψ. Because ψ is single-peaked, there must be a neighbor z of $x_{\max}$ such that $\psi(z) > \psi(x_{\max})$. Because $\psi(x_{\max})$ maximizes ψ in $\bar{S}$, z must be contained in S. We can lower bound γ by throwing away the flows across all edges in the numerator other than $(x_{\max}, z)$. Thus,

$$\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W| + d_G)} \left(\frac{\psi(x_{\max})\psi(z)}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2(|W| + d_G)} \left(\frac{\psi(x_{\max})^2}{\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\}} \right)^2. \tag{47}$$

Furthermore, $C_{\bar{S}} \leq \psi(x_{\max})^2 |V_G|$, and therefore $\min\{C_S, C_{\bar{S}}\} \leq \psi(x_{\max})^2 |V_G|$. Thus, in this case also, $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W|+d_G)|V_G|^2}$. □

4.3 Conductance Bound for Path Graphs

Here we note some consequences of proposition 4 in the case that G is the path graph of l vertices, G_l.

G_l =

Definition 4. *Let G be a graph with vertices V_G and edges E_G. Let $W : V_G \to \mathbb{R}$ be a potential. We say W is a single-basin potential if the set $\{x \in V_G | W(x) < E\}$ is a connected set of vertices in G for all E.*

As we now show, single-basin potentials on the path graph have single-peaked ground states and hence a large eigenvalue gap by proposition 4. For intuition, recall that, for a single particle in the one-dimensional continuum, the time-independent Schrödinger equation can be written as $-\frac{d^2\psi}{dx^2} = (E - W(x))\psi$. The ground state can be expressed with all real non-negative amplitudes. Hence the sign of $\frac{d^2\psi}{dx^2}$ is the same as the sign of $W(x) - E$. Thus, the ground state of a convex potential has simple structure: inside the well, $W(x) - E < 0$ and the wavefunction is concave down, whereas outside the well $W(x) - E > 0$ and the wavefunction is concave up. The path graph case, described below, is essentially a discrete analogue to this.

Remark: The notion of a single-basin potential is well-defined on any graph. On path graphs one can also easily define the notion of a convex potential. Simply think of the l vertices as corresponding to the integers $\{1, \ldots, l\}$ and demand that the potential on the vertices be equal to some convex function on $\mathbb{R}$ evaluated at these integer points. It is not hard to show that single-basin is a slightly weaker condition than convex. That is, on the path graph, all convex potentials are single-basin, but not all single-basin potentials are convex.

For a wavefunction ψ on the vertices of G, define

$$\Delta^2\psi(x) = -d_x\psi(x) + \sum_{y \in N_x} \psi(y), \tag{48}$$

where d_x is the degree of vertex x and N_x is the set vertices neighboring x. Thus,

$$L_G|\psi\rangle = -\sum_{x \in V_G} \Delta^2\psi(x)|x\rangle. \tag{49}$$

Proposition 5. *Suppose W is a single-basin potential on graph G. Let ψ be the ground state of the corresponding Hamiltonian $H_{G,W}$, and let*

$$S[\psi] = \{x \in V_G | \Delta^2\psi(x) < 0\}. \tag{50}$$

Then, $S[\psi]$ is a connected set of vertices in G.

Proof. Let E denote the ground energy of $H_{G,W}$. Thus, by (49),

$$\Delta^2\psi(x) = (W(x) - E)\psi(x) \tag{51}$$

Recall that $\psi(x) > 0 \quad \forall x \in V_G$. Thus, $\Delta^2\psi(x)$ has the same sign as $W(x) - E$. The connectedness of $S[\psi]$ then follows directly from the single-basin property. □

In special case that G is a path graph, the connectedness of $S[\psi]$ implies that ψ has only one local maximum. Thus, as a corollary of proposition 4, one obtains proposition 6. Note that on more general graphs, connectedness of $S[\psi]$ does not imply that ψ has only one local maximum.

Proposition 6. *Let W be a single-basin potential on the path graph G_l. Let $H_{G,W}$ be the corresponding Hamiltonian of the form (2). Let γ denote the gap between the ground energy and first excited energy of $H_{G,W}$. Then $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2(|W|+2)l^2}$ where $|W| = \max_{x \in V_G} W(x) - \min_{x \in V_G} W(x)$.*

Proposition 6 shows that for single-basin potentials on G_l, the eigenvalue gap obeys $\gamma = \Omega(1/l^2)$. In the special case of a flat potential, it is easy to solve for the eigenvalue gap exactly, which is $O(1/l^2)$. However, the bound of proposition 6 is not tight due to the dependence on $|W|$. In the next section, we obtain a tighter bound by applying the Poincaré inequality.

5 Poincaré-based Gap Bounds

Two of the main tools for proving lower bounds on the eigenvalue gap of stochastic matrices are the Cheeger inequality and the Poincaré inequality. Conductance methods, such as those described in §4.1, are originally derived from the Cheeger inequality [12]. For some random walks, the Poincaré inequality yields stronger lower bounds than the Cheeger inequality [16, 23], and for other random walks the reverse is true [29]. In §5.1, we recount the version of the Poincaré inequality given in [16] and apply it to Hamiltonians $H_{G,W}$ of the form (2). In §5.2 we specialize to the case of path graphs, obtaining a tighter bound than our conductance-based bound (proposition 6). (For a previous example in which Poincaré's inequality is used to bound the gap of a Hamiltonian see [9].)

5.1 The Poincaré Inequality

Let P be the transition matrix for an ergodic reversible discrete-time random walk on a graph G. Let π denote the limiting distribution and let γ denote the gap between the highest and second-highest eigenvalues of P. For any edge e in the graph G, let e_1, e_2 denote the vertices at its endpoints. Let $Q(e)$ denote the flow across edge e in the limiting distribution.

$$Q(e) = \pi_{e_1} P_{e_1,e_2} = \pi_{e_2} P_{e_2,e_1}. \tag{52}$$

The latter equality expresses the reversibility of the random walk. For each ordered pair (x, y) of distinct vertices in G, choose a canonical path γ_{xy} from x to y. Vertices may be repeated in a path, but no edge may be traversed more than once. Let Γ be the collection of canonical paths, one for each ordered pair of vertices. For $\gamma_{xy} \in \Gamma$, let

$$|\gamma_{xy}| = \sum_{e \in \gamma_{xy}} Q(e)^{-1} \tag{53}$$

where the sum is over the edges in path γ_{xy}. Let

$$\kappa(\Gamma) = \max_e \sum_{\gamma_{xy} \ni e} |\gamma_{xy}| \pi_x \pi_y. \tag{54}$$

The Poincaré inequality states [16]

$$\gamma \geq \frac{1}{\kappa}. \tag{55}$$

To obtain a tight bound on γ one must make a good choice of Γ.

Intuitively, the quantity $\frac{1}{\kappa}$, like the conductance Φ, quantifies the presence of a bottleneck across which the flow is small. As an example, consider a graph consisting of two large subgraphs connected

by only a single edge e. In this case, every pair of vertices spanning the pair of subgraphs has a canonical path crossing e. Correspondingly, $\sum_{\gamma_{xy} \ni e} |\gamma_{xy}| \pi_x \pi_y$ will be large, which implies large κ. Similarly, κ will be large if there are many edges connecting the two subgraphs to each other but the flow $Q(e)$ across all such edges is small. Only in the absence of such bottlenecks does (55) yield a large lower bound on the gap.

As in §4.2, we use (26) to obtain a stochastic matrix P from our Hamiltonian H such that the eigenvalue gap γ of P relates to the eigenvalue gap γ_H of H according to

$$\gamma_H = -E\gamma, \tag{56}$$

where E is the ground energy of H. The eigenvalue gap of P can be lower-bounded using the Poincaré inequality. Specifically, by (26), we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x,y) &= \frac{\psi(x)\psi(y)}{-E} && (57)\\ \pi_x &= \psi(x)^2 && (58)\\ \kappa &= \max_e \sum_{\gamma_{xy} \ni e} \psi(x)^2 \psi(y)^2 \sum_{g \in \gamma_{xy}} \frac{-E}{\psi(g_1)\psi(g_2)}. && (59) \end{aligned}$$

Here ψ is the ground state of H, and g_1, g_2 are the two vertices connected by edge g. By (56) the ground energy cancels from the final bound on γ_H. Summarizing:

$$\gamma_H \geq \frac{1}{\kappa'}, \tag{60}$$

where

$$\kappa' = \max_e \sum_{\gamma_{xy} \ni e} \psi(x)^2 \psi(y)^2 \sum_{g \in \gamma_{xy}} \frac{1}{\psi(g_1)\psi(g_2)}. \tag{61}$$

5.2 Poincaré Bound for Path Graphs

For path graphs, there is only one valid choice of canonical paths Γ. Specifically, for a pair of vertices $s < f$ the canonical path is $s, s+1, \ldots, f$. For $f < s$ one takes the reverse path. Thus, (61) reduces to

$$\kappa' = \max_{1 \leq j \leq l-1} 2 \sum_{s \leq j} \sum_{f > j} R(s,f) \tag{62}$$

where

$$R(s,f) = \psi(s)^2 \psi(f)^2 \sum_{s \leq v < f} \frac{1}{\psi(v)\psi(v+1)}. \tag{63}$$

The factor of 2 in (62) arises because we sum only over the paths with $s < f$ and use the fact that $R(s,f) = R(f,s)$.

As discussed in §4.3, if the potential on the path graph is single-basin, then the ground state wavefunction has only one local maximum. Thus, the minimum of $\psi(v)$ along a segment $s \leq v < f$ must occur at one of the endpoints. If the minimum is at s then (63) yields

$$\begin{aligned} R(s,f) &\leq \psi(s)^2 \psi(f)^2 \sum_{s \leq v < f} \frac{1}{\psi(s)^2} && (64)\\ &= (f-s)\psi(f)^2. && (65) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if the minimum is at f then one has $R(s,f) \leq (f-s)\psi(s)^2$.

Let J be the value of j that achieves the maximum in (62). Then

$$\kappa' \leq 2 \sum_{s \leq J} \sum_{f > J} (f-s) \psi(b_{s,f})^2 \tag{66}$$

where $b_{s,f}$ is either s or f depending on which is smaller amongst $\psi(s)^2$ and $\psi(f)^2$. We can rewrite this sum over pairs of vertices as

$$\sum_{s \leq J} \sum_{f > J} (f-s) \psi(b_{s,f})^2 = \sum_{b=1}^{l} \sum_{a \in S_b} |a-b| \psi(b)^2, \tag{67}$$

where, for a given vertex b, S_b is the set of vertices on the other side of edge J such that $\psi(a)^2 \leq \psi(b)^2$. (For some b, S_b can be empty.) From (67) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa' &\leq 2 \sum_{b=1}^{l} \psi(b)^2 \sum_{a \in S_b} |a-b| & (68) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{b=1}^{l} \psi(b)^2 \sum_{a=1}^{l-1} a & (69) \\ &= \sum_{b=1}^{l} \psi(b)^2 l(l-1) & (70) \\ &\leq l(l-1). & (71) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $\psi(b)^2$ is a probability distribution over $1, \ldots, l$. Thus, by (60),

$$\gamma_H \geq \frac{1}{l(l-1)}. \tag{72}$$

By direct calculation, one finds that the eigenvalue gap for the length l chain with no potential ($W = 0$) is $4 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2l} \right)$. Thus, the bound (72) is asymptotically tight to within a factor of π^2 [25].

6 Application to Adiabatic Optimization Algorithms

In this section, we show that, as a corollary of proposition 4, adiabatic optimization algorithms in which the ground state $\psi(s)$ is single-peaked for all s, have minimum gap at least $\Omega(1/|V_G|^2)$ and therefore run in $\widetilde{O}(|V_G|^4)$ time, by an adiabatic theorem [17]. (The $\widetilde{O}$ notation indicates that we are omitting logarithmic factors.) This result cannot be used directly to find algorithmic speedups, as exhaustive search runs in $O(|V_G|)$ time. However, we believe this analysis may be useful in cases of high symmetry such as [30, 32, 19], where the eigenvalue gap on exponentially large graphs can be determined by analyzing the spectrum of polynomial-size graphs. In addition, the analysis in this section provides an illustrative example of how proposition 4 may be applied to the analysis of adiabatic optimization problems.

Consider an adiabatic optimization algorithm using a Hamiltonian $H_{G,W}(s)$ of the form shown in (5). Then

$$\hat{H}_{G,W}(s) = \frac{1}{1-s} H_{G,W}(s) \tag{73}$$

is of the form (2) addressed by proposition 4. $\hat{H}_{G,W}(s)$ and $H_{G,W}(s)$ have the same ground state, which we denote $\psi(s)$. Thus, if $\psi(s)$ is single-peaked for all $s \in [0,1)$ we may conclude from proposition 4 that

$$\hat{\gamma}(s) \geq \frac{1}{2\left(|\hat{W}(s)| + d_G\right)|V_G|^2}, \tag{74}$$

where $\hat{W}(s) = \frac{s}{1-s}W$ is the potential in $\hat{H}_{G,W}(s)$. Hence, one substitutes $|\hat{W}(s)| = \frac{s}{1-s}|W|$ and $\gamma(s) = (1-s)\hat{\gamma}(s)$ into (74), obtaining

$$\gamma(s) \geq \frac{1-s}{2\left(\frac{s}{1-s}|W| + d_G\right)|V_G|^2}. \tag{75}$$

One sees that this lower bound on $\gamma(s)$ becomes very small as s closely approaches 1. For the final part of the adiabatic optimization algorithm we therefore use a different method to lower-bound the eigenvalue gap. As an illustrative example, we suppose that the gap between the minimum of W and the second smallest value taken by W is one. Thus, by (5), $\gamma(1) = 1$. Generalization to other values of $\gamma(1)$ is straightforward and yields the same scaling with $|V_G|$ and d_G. At $s = 1-\delta$, one has

$$H(s) = \delta L_G + (1-\delta)W. \tag{76}$$

By Gershgorin's circle theorem, one sees that the operator norm of L_G is at most $2d_G$. Thus, the operator norm of δL_G is at most $2\delta d_G$. Hence, Weyl's inequalities show that the worst case is that the addition of δL_G to $(1-\delta)W$ shifts the ground energy up by $2\delta d_G$ and shifts the first excited energy down by $2\delta d_G$. Thus, adding δL_G to $(1-\delta)W$ at worst decreases the gap from $1-\delta$ to $1-\delta-4\delta d_G$. Thus,

$$\gamma(s) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{8d_G} \quad \forall s \in \left[1 - \frac{1}{8d_G}, 1\right]. \tag{77}$$

The degree d_G is at least 2 for any connected graph of more than two vertices, so for all nontrivial cases one has

$$\gamma(s) \geq \frac{7}{16} \quad \forall s \in \left[1 - \frac{1}{8d_G}, 1\right]. \tag{78}$$

For the remaining values of s, (75) yields

$$\gamma(s) \geq \frac{\frac{1}{8d_G}}{2\left(8d_G|W| + d_G\right)|V_G|^2} \quad \forall s \in \left[0, 1 - \frac{1}{8d_G}\right]. \tag{79}$$

Together, (78) and (79) yield

$$\gamma(s) = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{d_G^2|W||V_G|^2}\right) \quad \forall s \in [0,1]. \tag{80}$$

The adiabatic theorem of [24] shows that adiabaticity will be maintained by evolving according to the linear-interpolation Hamiltonian $H_{G,W}(t/\tau)$ with runtime τ bounded by

$$\tau = O\left(\frac{\left\|\frac{dH}{ds}\right\|^2}{\gamma^3}\right). \tag{81}$$

By (5), $\left\|\frac{dH}{ds}\right\| = O(d_G + |W|)$. Thus, by (80) and (81),

$$\tau = O\left(d_G^6 |W|^3 |V_G|^6 (|W| + d_G)^2\right). \tag{82}$$

As shown in [17], a tighter bound on running time can be obtained by choosing a more optimized interpolation schedule between the initial and final Hamiltonians. Specifically, one should choose the interpolation such that $H(t)$ is infinitely differentiable but is time-independent outside of $t \in [0, \tau]$. For example, let

$$H(t) = (1 - s(t/\tau))L_G + s(t/\tau)W \tag{83}$$

where s is the following "switching function", which is infinitely differentiable, and satisfies $s(0) = 0$, $s(1) = 1$, and $s'(x) = 0\ \forall x \notin (0, 1)$:

$$s(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} g(y)dy \tag{84}$$

$$g(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y \notin [0, 1] \\ \beta \exp\left(-\frac{1}{y(1-y)}\right) & \text{if } y \in (0, 1) \end{cases}. \tag{85}$$

$$\tag{86}$$

Here, β is the normalization constant yielding $f(1) = 1$. In this case, as shown in [17], by evolving with $H(t)$ from time zero to τ one achieves adiabaticity with runtime

$$\tau = O\left(\frac{(\log(1/\gamma))^{12}}{\gamma^2}\right). \tag{87}$$

For a Hamiltonian in which the ground state is always single-peaked, (87) and (80) yield runtime

$$\tau = \widetilde{O}(V_G^4). \tag{88}$$

7 Concluding Remarks

The examples analyzed here and in [30, 32, 19, 33, 7] show that quantum adiabatic algorithms can succeed in finding the minimum in polynomial time in cases where classical local search fails to do so, and it can fail in cases where classical local search succeeds. For both classical local search and adiabatic optimization, local minima of the potential that one is seeking to minimize play an important role in determining runtime. However, as the present work shows, these local minima do not tell the whole story. In particular, absence of local minima does not imply large eigenvalue gap.

In addition, we note that there remains much to be learned regarding the performance of adiabatic optimization algorithms relative to classical computation in the general case that one is not comparing only to classical local search. In particular, the classical algorithm described in appendix A of [13] finds the minimum in polynomial time for most of the known examples in which adiabatic optimization beats classical local search. We hope that the tools developed here will be helpful in investigating this issue.

Acknowledgments: We thank Amanda Streib, Noah Strieb, and Alexey Gorshkov for useful conversations. Portions of this paper are a contribution of NIST, an agency of the US government, and are not subject to US copyright. This work was supported in part by the center for Quantum Information and Computer Science (QuICS).

References

[1] Dorit Aharonov and Amnon Ta-Shma. Adiabatic quantum state generation and statistical zero knowledge. In *STOC '03: Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 20–29, 2003. arXiv:quant-ph/0301023.

[2] Dorit Aharonov, Wim van Dam, Julia Kempe, Zeph Landau, Seth Lloyd, and Oded Regev. Adiabatic quantum computation is equivalent to standard quantum computation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(1):166–194, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0405098.

[3] Abbas Al-Shimary and Jiannis K. Pachos. Energy gaps of Hamiltonians from graph Laplacians. *arXiv:1010.4130*, 2010.

[4] N. Alon and V. D. Milman. λ_1, isoperimetric inequalities for graphs, and superconcentrators. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 38:73–88, 1985.

[5] Boris Altshuler, Hari Krovi, and Jérémie Roland. Anderson localization makes adiabatic quantum optimization fail. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(28):12446–12450, 2010.

[6] M. H. S. Amin. Effect of local minima on adiabatic quantum optimization. *Physical Review Letters*, 100:130503, 2008. arXiv:0709.0528.

[7] M. H. S. Amin and V. Choi. First order quantum phase transition in adiabatic quantum computation. *Phyisical Review A*, 80:062326, 2009. arXiv:0904.1387.

[8] Mark S. Ashbaugh and Rafael D. Benguria. Some eigenvalue inequalities for a class of Jacobi matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 136:215–234, 1990.

[9] Sergey Bravyi, Libor Caha, Ramis Movassagh, Daniel Nagaj, and Peter Shor. Criticality without frustration for quantum spin-1 chains. *Physical Review Letters*, 109:207202, 2012. arXiv:1203.5801.

[10] Sergey Bravyi, David P. DiVincenzo, Roberto Oliveira, and Barbara M. Terhal. The complexity of stoquastic local Hamiltonian problems. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 8(5):361–385, 2008. arXiv:quant-ph/0606140.

[11] Sergey Bravyi and Barbara Terhal. Complexity of stoquastic frustration-free Hamiltonians. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(4):1462, 2009. arXiv:0806.1746.

[12] Jeff Cheeger. A lower bound for the smallest value of the Laplacian. In *Problems in Analysis*, pages 195–199. Princeton University Press, 1970.

[13] Andrew M. Childs, Richard Cleve, Enrico Deotto, Edward Farhi, Sam Gutmann, and Daniel A. Spielman. Exponential algorithmic speedup by a quantum walk. In *STOC '03: Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 59–68, 2003. arXiv:quant-ph/0209131.

[14] Fan R. K. Chung. *Spectral Graph Theory*. Number 92 in Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 1997.

[15] Elizabeth Crosson, Edward Farhi, Cedric Yen-Yu Lin, Han-Hsuan Lin, and Peter Shor. Different strategies for optimization using the quantum adiabatic algorithm. *arXiv:1401.7320*, 2014.

[16] Persi Diaconis and Daniel Stroock. Geometric bounds for eigenvalues of Markov chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 1(1):36–61, 1991.

[17] Alexander Elgart and George A. Hagedorn. A note on the switching adiabatic theorem. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 53:102202, 2012.

[18] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, David Gosset, Sam Gutmann, Harvey B. Meyer, and Peter Shor. Quantum adiabatic algorithms, small gaps, and different paths. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 11:181–214, 2011. arXiv:0909.4766.

[19] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. Quantum adiabatic evolution algorithms versus simulated annealing. *arXiv:quant-ph/0201031*, 2002.

[20] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. Quantum adiabatic evolution algorithms with different paths. *arXiv:quant-ph/0208135*, 2002.

[21] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutmann, Joshua Lapan, Andrew Lundgren, and Daniel Preda. A quantum adiabatic evolution algorithm applied to random instances of an NP-complete problem. *Science*, 292(5516):472–475, 2001. arXiv:quant-ph/0104129.

[22] A. B. Finnila, M. A. Gomez, C. Sebenik, C. Stenson, and J. D. Doll. Quantum annealing: a new method for minimizing multidimensional functions. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 219:343–348, 1994.

[23] J. Fulman and E. L. Wilmer. Comparing eigenvalue bounds for Markov chains: when does Poincaré beat Cheeger? *Annals of Applied Probability*, 9(1):1–13, 1999.

[24] Sabine Jansen, Mary-Beth Ruskai, and Ruedi Seiler. Bounds for the adiabatic approximation with applications to quantum computation. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 48:102111, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0603175.

[25] Michael Jarret and Stephen P. Jordan. Fundamental gap for a class of Schrödinger operators on path and hypercube graphs. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 55(5):052104, 2014. arXiv:1403.1473.

[26] Albert Messiah. *Quantum Mechanics*. Dover, 1961.

[27] Daniel Nagaj, Rolando D. Somma, and Maria Kieferova. Quantum speedup by quantum annealing. *Physical Review Letters*, 109:050501, 2012. arXiv:1202.6257.

[28] L. E. Payne and H. F. Weinberger. An optimal Poincaré inequality for convex domains. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 5(1):286–292, 1960.

[29] John Pike. A note on the Poincaré and Cheeger inequalities for simple random walk on a connected graph. *arXiv:1210.5777*, 2012.

[30] Ben Reichardt. The quantum adiabatic optimization algorithm and local minima. In *Proceedings of STOC '04*, pages 502–510, 2004.

[31] Alistair Sinclair. *Algorithms for random generation and counting: a Markov chain approach*. Birkhauser, 1993.

[32] Wim van Dam, Michele Mosca, and Umesh Vazirani. How powerful is adiabatic quantum computation? In *Proceedings of FOCS '01*, pages 279–287, 2001. arXiv:quant-ph/0206003.

[33] Wim van Dam and Umesh Vazirani. Limits of quantum adiabatic optimization. `www.cs.berkeley.edu/~vazirani/pubs/qao.pdf`, 2003.